

### **REMARKS**

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough consideration provided the present application. Claims 1, 2 and 4-6 are now present in the application. Claims 1 and 2 have been amended. Claim 3 has been cancelled. Claim 1 is independent. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

#### **Drawings Objections**

The drawings have been objected under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a). Since claim 3 has been cancelled, Applicants respectfully submit that this objection has been obviated and/or rendered moot. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner's drawings objection are respectfully requested.

#### **Claim Objections**

Claim 1 has been objected to due to the presence of minor informalities. In view of the foregoing amendments, in which the Examiner's helpful suggestions have been followed, it is respectfully submitted that this objection has been addressed. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112**

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Since claim 3 has been cancelled to expedite the prosecution of the present application, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection has been obviated and/or rendered moot. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, are therefore respectfully requested.

### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1, 2 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hucks, U.S. Patent No. 5,755,507. Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hucks in view of Bahadur, U.S. Patent No. 6,639,349. Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hucks in view of Ogawa, U.S. Patent No. 4,766,524. Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hucks in view of Sato, JP 02272485. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

In light of the foregoing amendments, Applicants respectfully submit that these rejections have been obviated and/or rendered moot. As the Examiner will note, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite a combination of elements including “the electrodes of adjacent light-emitting elements located at the driving circuit board respectively extending to two sides of the driving circuit board”. Support for the above combination of elements can be found in FIGs. 2-4 of the instant application as originally filed. Applicants respectfully submit that the above

combination of elements as set forth in amended independent claim 1 is not disclosed nor suggested by the references relied on by the Examiner.

Hucks discloses a device for interconnecting a lighting fixture, including a plurality of lamps 122 and lamp receptacles 120 (see FIGs. 5-6). Hucks also discloses the lamp receptacles 120 as the means for energizing the lamps 122 (see col. 2, lines 20-21) and that the wiring sequentially connects each lamp receptacle 120. Therefore, although Hucks does not disclose the location of the electrodes of the lamps 122, it is believed that the lamp receptacles 120 are used to receive the electrodes of the lamps 122. However, Hucks fails to teach any driving circuit board. Therefore, Hucks also fails to teach that “the electrodes of adjacent light-emitting elements located at the driving circuit board respectively extending to two sides of the driving circuit board” as recited in amended claim 1. In addition, the electrodes of the lamps 122 are received by the lamp receptacles 120 and therefore cannot extend to any side of the driving circuit board.

Although FIG. 1 of the instant application discloses a driving circuit board, the electrodes of adjacent light-emitting elements 12 located at the driving circuit board 11 do not extend to the two opposite sides of the driving circuit board 11. Therefore, modifying the structure of FIG. 1 of the instant application in view of Hucks still fails to teach “the electrodes of adjacent light-emitting elements located at the driving circuit board respectively extending to two sides of the driving circuit board” as recited in amended claim 1.

With regard to the Examiner’s reliance on Bahadur, Ogawa and Sato, these references have only been relied on for their teachings related to the subject matter of dependent claims.

These references also fail to disclose the above combination of elements as set forth in amended independent claim 1. Accordingly, these references fail to cure the deficiencies of Hucks.

Accordingly, none of the references utilized by the Examiner individually or in combination teach or suggest the limitations of amended independent claim 1 or its dependent claims. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 and its dependent claims clearly define over the teachings of the references relied on by the Examiner.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are respectfully requested.

### **CONCLUSION**

Since the remaining patents cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject the claims, but merely to show the state of the prior art, no further comments are necessary with respect thereto.

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.


In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Joe McKinney Muncy, Registration No. 32,334 at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By

  
Joe McKinney Muncy  
Reg. No. 32,334

KM/GH/mmi/cl  
2450-0626P



P. O. Box 747  
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747